

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of

Applicant : Dan Thaxton
Serial No. : 10/079,679
Filed : February 20, 2002
Title : DOCUMENT SECURITY PROTECTION ANALYSIS ASSISTANT
Docket : STD 1067 PA/41213.314
Examiner : Kamal, Shahid
Art Unit : 3718
Conf. No. : 6750

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

This Statement is further to the Interview Summary mailed December 27, 2010 by the Patent Examiner in the above identified application, regarding a telephonic interview held on December 13, 2010 between Examiner Shahid Kamal, and applicant's attorney, James F. Gottman. The Examiner's summary of the substance of the interview is correct.

MPEP §713.04 indicates that the applicant should address the following points, at a minimum:

(A) a brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted;

No exhibits were shown.

(B) identification of the claims discussed;

Claims 1 and 20 were discussed.

(C) identification of specific prior art discussed;

Townsend and Rhoads were discussed briefly.

(D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner;

Applicant's attorney agreed to the amendments set out in the Examiner's Amendment of December 27, 2010.

(E) the general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate;

Applicant's attorney agreed to the addition of clarifying language in the preambles of claims 1 and 20, specifying that the security features are on the security document, and to the recitation of "using said computer system" in claim 20 to make clear that the claim is directed to a machine implemented method.

(F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed;

It was agreed that claims 1 and 20 would be amended by Examiner's Amendment.

(G) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview; and

Claims 1 - 20 were to be allowed after entry of the Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL, L.L.P.

By /James F. Gottman/

James F. Gottman

Registration No. 27,262

Fifth Third Center
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6400
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405
e-mail: james.gottman@dinslaw.com